

Yang Puff file
9 August 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Plans Staff

SUBJECT : Status of Agency Professional, Grades GS-07 to GS-11

1. In order to get a better understanding of the status of the professional in Grades GS-07 to GS-11, I consulted each office and/or Career Service and raised seven specific questions with the Personnel representative. The questions are as follows:

a. Has your office (or Career Service) made distinctions in considering the promotion and development of personnel Grades GS-07 to GS-11; i.e., differentiated between employees categorized professional, technical, or clerical with regard to time-in-grade requirements, promotion quotas, etc.?

b. Can you readily determine the number of professionals you have at each grade level in the GS-07 to GS-11 range?

c. Have you had continuing problems in accommodating the promotion of professional employees in this grade range? How do you view the future in this regard?


d. Do you have a specified time-in-grade policy for the promotion of professionals in this grade range?

e. If you were to make a judgment, how long do you estimate it presently takes for the professional in your office (or Career Service) to move from the GS-07 to GS-11 level?

f. (Asked only when applicable.) Could your office (or Career Service) within its present CSGA framework assure the promotion of qualified and deserving professionals from GS-07 to GS-11 on an annual basis?

g. Is your recruitment at these grade levels down, holding its own, or increasing? What is your most typical EOD grade?

2. I consulted each office in the DDS&T although they operate as one Career Service. By an actual count as of June 1971, the DDS&T had the following professionals on board:

- a. GS-11
 - b. GS-10
 - c. GS-09
 - d. GS-08
 - e. GS-07
- 

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900060005-6

Without exception, each office in the DDS&T did differentiate between its employees in response to question a. The distinctions, however, were minor. I was assured by each representative that the office had knowledge of the specific number of professionals it had in this grade range. The offices differed considerably in their response to question c. The reason seemed to be that in several offices, although they had professionals in this grade range, their positions and people were few. Consequently, personnel movement was practically nil and a cause of increasing concern with respect to programming replacements. Nearly every office indicated that recruitment was down or was holding its own; i.e., comparable to the years past. OSA and FMSAC were the only two offices in the DDS&T that did not ordinarily promote their professionals in the GS-07 to GS-11 range in four years or less. Again because of the nature of their T/O's, this was not viewed as a big problem nor one that had a negative effect on employee morale.

3. Similar results were found in the DDI. I determined that very few offices had any difficulty in promoting their professionals within a four year span of time. IAS and OSR represented the offices with the longest time for upward movement in this grade range; namely, about six years. I was assured by each personnel representative, however, that to date each office had not experienced any problem with respect to the promotion of deserving professionals from Grade GS-07 to GS-11. Most offices were somewhat apprehensive about the future to the extent that since headroom has been often a problem at the higher grades, it would soon make itself felt at the lower levels. Again, the development of a professional from the GS-07 to the GS-11 level was influenced by the fact that certain offices have relatively few jobs in this grade range and people presently in these jobs are not competitive for positions at a higher level. This was specifically mentioned by IRS who incidentally has only [REDACTED] presently on duty in this grade range. STATINTL

4. The practices of the DDS Directorate, with regard to distinctions made in differentiating between professionals and other employees, were similar to those of other Directorates. The Office of Medical Services and the Office of Training have very few professional personnel in this grade range. Professional development in this grade range for these offices is not a problem, except of the kind noted by IRS. The Office of Personnel generally takes longer than the other offices in the DDS in moving its professional from the GS-07 to GS-11 level. Most of the others are able to promote their professionals in this grade range on close to an annual basis.

5. The DDP represents a more complicated picture. At the moment the professional in the DDP is developed in various ways. Some are developed through the DDP Professional Trainee Program, others through the Agency Career Trainee Program, and an increasing number of others through the mechanism provided [REDACTED] This instruction spells out the means whereby a non-professional DDP employee may become professional. Promotion timetables vary depending upon which or how many of these routes within the DDP the employee travels. Changes occurring during the past STATINTL

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900060005-6

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900060005-6

few years have caused this timetable to vary so much that it is nearly impossible to identify with real accuracy the average time a DDP professional spends in grade during his development to the GS-11 level. By and large, it is estimated the professional moves upward to the GS-11 level in about five to six years time.

6. Certain general impressions were gained in this inquiry. First off, the various offices and Career Services have been able for the most part to move the promotable professional from Grade GS-07 to GS-11 in a reasonable period of time; i.e., four to six years. There are differences from office to office with regard to promotion practices, but these appear to be rather minor and are a reflection primarily of the organizational peculiarities of the office. I believe that the great concern regarding the status of the professional in Grades GS-07 to GS-11 resulted as a direct consequence of the large number of Career Trainees pumped into the various Directorates in the late sixties. Being a cohesive "fraternity," these CT's routinely compared notes as they went their separate ways following their assignment from the Program to a particular office. It soon became clear to both the office and the CT that the treatment of the Career Trainee was not uniform throughout the Agency. This became a serious point of issue in a short period of time. Since the CT Program has been cut to the bone in terms of Agency CT input each year, and since other professional input to the various components has also diminished, I am of the opinion that the issue of disparate treatment for the young professional in the Agency will shortly lose its impact, both on the employee and management.

7. Apparently, no office anticipates any serious trouble developing the number of professionals in the GS-07 to GS-11 grade range they are now willing and able to accept. The question of special concern to the offices at the moment has to do with establishing the proper rate of movement for a professional to the GS-11 level. Promotional growth from that point on becomes sharply competitive for most offices. There are those who believe the Agency should slow or closely monitor the promotion of the junior officers in this grade range so that his patience for promotion delays at higher grade levels might hopefully be increased; i.e., GS-11 to GS-12. On the other hand, there are others who believe the young professional should be regularly and steadily moved to the GS-11 level which (a) represents the journeyman level in most offices and (b) represents a salary level inclined to reduce the officer's anxiety about his personal financial situation. Consequently, his ability to focus on the non-monetary aspects of the meaning of remaining with the Agency on a career basis is thought to be improved.


Plans Staff
Office of Personnel

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000900060005-6

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY